

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS	§	
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
v.	§	
SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS	§	Case No. 2:13-cv-259-RSP
AMERICA, LLC,	§	
Defendant.	§	

ORDER

Before the Court is MTEL’s Motion for Leave to Supplement the Expert Reports of Dr. Jay P. Kesan and Dr. Ray Nettleton (Dkt. 53, the “Motion”). MTEL asks for leave to supplement, but fails to set forth good cause beyond the fact that the Court issued an order regarding the plain and ordinary meaning of the word “retransmission.” (Mot. at 1-2.) MTEL merely states that it wishes to discuss “the effect of the Court’s additional claim construction.” (*Id.*) But this Court’s ordinary practice is to prohibit any reference to its claim construction rulings, and it ordered the parties in this case to refrain from such references well before any of the current issues regarding retransmission arose: “the parties are ordered to refrain from mentioning any portion of this opinion, other than the actual definitions adopted by the Court, in the presence of the jury.” (Dkt. 162 in Case No. 2:12-cv-832 at 74-75.) There is no reason for MTEL’s experts to refer to the Court’s rulings on the word “retransmission” other than to say that it carries its plain and ordinary meaning. Accordingly, the Motion is **DENIED**.

SIGNED this 15th day of December, 2014.



ROY S. PAYNE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE